

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexasdra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/536,919	02/21/2006	Ziaoling Shao	CN 020016	6591	
24737 PHII IPS INTE	7590 07/29/200 ELLECTUAL PROPER	EXAM	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001			LAI, MICHAEL C		
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2157		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/29/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/536,919	SHAO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
MICHAEL C. LAI	2157	

	MICHAEL C. LAI	2157			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 27 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.			
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following i application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: a) The period for reply expires	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit all (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed date of the final rejection. dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or within one of the follow in the final rejection, whi	rhich places the r (3) a Request ving time chever is later. In		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as		
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the company of th	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the			
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>					
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better the service of the service	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).		
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the		
7. \(\times \) for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [\(\times \) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: \(\times \) none. Claim(s) objected to: \(\times \) none. Claim(s) rejected: \(\times \) 1224. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \(\times \) none.		be entered and an e	xplanation of		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	I sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant faile e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).		
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.		
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:		
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)				
_					
/Ario Etienne/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157					

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument, see page 11, with respect to "[a]communication gateway won't be needed if the personal computer 101 and the cell phone 108 belong to the same network", is not persuasive. According to Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fifth Edition, a gateway is "A device that connects networks using different communications protocols so that information can be passed from one to the other. A gateway both transfers information and converts it to a form compatible with the protocols used by the receiving network.". In the reference to Caloud, the communications gateway 128 is used to bridge the Internet network 106, to which the personal computer 101 belongs, and the Cell network 118, to which the cell phone 108 belongs (see FIG. 1). As such, "the gateway won't be needed if the personal computer IO1 and the cell phone 108 belong to the same network". Applicant's argument, see page 12, with respect to "the Final Office Action fails to make a prima facie case of anticipation because Caloud does not satisfy MPEP section 2131 as an anticipatory reference", is not persuasive. Caloud teaches every element of the claimed invention as identified in the office action. Therefore the reference to Caloud satisfies MPEP section 2131 as an anticipatory reference. Applicant's argument, see page 12, with respect to "In fact, Caloud teaches away from a direct communication between the personal computer and the cell phone such that "Itihe gateway 128 is thus in a position to fifter messages addressed to the terminal 108 and thus avoid undesirable messages."", is not persuasive. The reference to Caloud is directed to "a method for the addressing of a mobile terminal" including address translation between IMSI/MSISDN and IP address (see FIG. 1 Tables 127 and 133, and column 8, lines 33-53). In FIG. 2, the resolution server 119 accepts connection invitations according to the SIP protocol. These invitations are transmitted, after the resolution of the SIP address, at the mobile terminal 108 in the form of a short message. The mobile terminal 108 accepts or rejects the connection request. In the event of acceptance, the mobile terminal 108 makes a request for the allocation of communications means to the gateway 128 (see abstract). As one can see in FIG. 2, after connection is complete, all traffic going from the personal computer 101 to the mobile terminal 108 via the gateway 128 without going through the resolution server 119. In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "wireless network system that enables direct wireless delivery of a multimedia message from a first multimedia messaging service (MMS) user agent to a second MMS user agent" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See In re Hirao, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and Kropa v. Robie, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951), .